

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claim 1 is amended. The amendments to claim 1 can be found at least in paragraph [0022] of the original specification. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano (EP 1,136,973) in view of Jarnebrick et al. (US 6,630,228).

Applicants submit that the claims as now pending are allowable over the cited prior art. Specifically, amended independent claim 1 recites a display window protection panel for an electronic apparatus fitted into a display window opening for protecting a portion of a display device, the protection panel comprising a decorating film disposed so as to cover an entire surface of the protection panel.

The prior art fails to disclose or render obvious such a protection panel. In particular, as recognized by the Examiner, Yano fails to disclose the recited decorating film. *See* pg. 3 of the July 20, 2010 Office Action. For this element, the Examiner relies on Jarnebrick. The Examiner suggests that the Jarnebrick “surrounding frame 9” corresponds to the decorating film recited in claim 1 of the present application. Applicants submit that the surrounding frame 9 in Jarnebrick is not disposed so as to cover an entire surface of the protection panel, as required by claim 1 of the present invention. First, as admitted by the Examiner, the Jarnebrick element is a “surrounding frame”, i.e., surrounds display window 5. Second, as discussed in col. 3, lines 9-14 of Jarnebrick, blanks 7 have a display window 5 with a delimiting frame 6 of non-adhesion coating and a surrounding frame 9 that has been treated with adhesion coating. Thus, Applicants submit that frame 6 delimits the area between surrounding frame 9 and display window 5. Jarnebrick clarifies this structure by stating that “polyurethane 10, applied in liquid state, will spread on the frame 9 that has been treated with adhesion coating. The delimiting frame 6 of non-adhesion coating will prevent the polyurethane 10 from spreading on the display window 5”. *See* col. 3, lines 22-25. Thus, it is clear from these portions of Jarnebrick that the surrounding frame 9 of Jarnebrick is not disposed so as to cover an entire surface of a protection panel, as

required by the decorating film recited in independent claim 1, but rather surrounds display window 5.

Additionally, the decorating film, recited in claim 1 of the present invention, has advantageous over the cited prior art. That is, the structure of the present invention, as recited in independent claim 1, will prohibit air bubbles from being caught between the transparent protective plate and the decorating film. Additionally, the present invention, as recited in claim 1, will result in a flat, aesthetically pleasing structure. On the other hand, as shown in Fig. 9, the Jarnebrick structure will result in a raised surrounding frame that can be broken or damaged when handled. Therefore, it is clear that Jarnebrick does not disclose the structure of the present invention, as recited in independent claim 1, nor does Jarnebrick have the advantageous of such a structure.

Moreover, there is no reasoning in the prior art to modify Jarnebrick such that it would have rendered independent claim 1 obvious. Any such reasoning would have involved improper hindsight. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 5-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano and Jarnebrick in view of Keiichi (JP 2002-072214). Claims 9 and 11-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano and Jarnebrick in view of Tanube (US 7,014,916). Claims 14-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano, Jarnebrick, and Keiichi, in view of Tanube.

Applicants submit that since each of these claims is dependent from independent claim 1, and since none of the additionally cited references overcomes the deficiencies of the combination of Yano and Jarnebrick discussed above, each of these claims is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now pending in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be allowed, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yasuji KUSUDA et al.

/Jeffrey J. Howell/

By 2010.11.22 15:41:09 -05'00'

Jeffrey J. Howell

Registration No. 46,402

Attorney for Applicants

JJH/etc

Washington, D.C. 20005-1503

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

November 22, 2010